

## **REMARKS**

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-55 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, the specification and claims 10, 20, 33, 34, 38, 46, and 47 have been amended. New claim 55 has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above Amendments and the following remarks.

### **Objection to the drawings**

The Office Action objects to the drawings because displayed reference signs were not included in the specification. Accordingly, the specification has been revised to describe the displayed reference signs. No new matter has been added. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 10, 37, and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as claiming subject matter not described in the specification. In order to expedite the prosecution, the subject matter related to "creating a resource update window" has been deleted from the claims 10, 20, and 47. The rejection is traversed as applied to claim 37 since original claim 37 did not include this language and is clear and definite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 14, 15, 18, 33, 34, 38, 39, 41, 43, 44, 51, and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,754,854 to Kanamori et al. (hereinafter "Kanamori"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claim 1, Kanamori fails to show several claimed features. First, Kanamori fails to show the step of obtaining resource data and storing a single shared copy of the resource data to be utilized by each of the two or more applications. The Office Action alleges on page 3, paragraph 3 and page 4, paragraph 5, that Kanamori's "proxy" is a single shared copy of a resource. On the contrary, the "proxy" is defined by Kanamori as a "group of parallel resources". See Column 2, lines 61-63 of Kanamori. The group of parallel resources is provided as a proxy or substitute for a single shared resource. Kanamori copies each global resource for each requesting

transferee program in order to create a proxy resource. The multiple copies or proxy resources function as a proxy for the single global resource. See column 4, lines 27-36 of Kanamori.

Accordingly, Kanamori discloses a method that is nearly the opposite of the method of claim 1. Kanamori creates multiple copies of private resources. Each private resource is accessible to a transferee. Kanamori discloses a technique operable for an operating system that does not provide a memory allocation service that enables a transferor to allocate a global memory block that is accessible to a transferee. See Column 2, lines 15-20 of Kanamori. Upon receiving each request for a resource, the facility of Kanamori makes a copy of the contents of the original block in an allocated proxy memory block. See Column 6, lines 20-25 of Kanamori. Therefore, in Kanamori, each proxy block is a copy. A copy is created upon each transferee request. In contrast, claim 1 creates a "single shared copy" of the resource data.

Because Kanamori fails to disclose a single shared copy of resource data, Kanamori also fails to disclose processing data requests by utilizing the single shared copy. Furthermore, claim 1 defines the single shared copy as allowing sharing in order to avoid duplication of resources. The Office Action states on page 4, last four lines, that there is no need to duplicate resources in Kanamori. On the contrary, Kanamori aims to duplicate resources multiple times by providing multiple copies.

Since Kanamori fails to show each and every feature of claim 1, Kanamori fails to anticipate claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

Similarly, with regard to independent claim 18, Kanamori fails to disclose obtaining a single shared copy of GDI/font resource data, wherein the single shared copy is configured to allow sharing by multiple instances of SDI applications. Kanamori additionally fails to disclose receiving font data process requests from the SDI applications and processing the requests using the shared copy.

Accordingly, because Kanamori fails to show each and every feature of claim 18, Kanamori fails to anticipate claim 18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

With regard to independent claim 33, Kanamori fails to disclose a cross- process resource sharing system disposed between an operating system and multiple client applications. Furthermore, Kanamori fails to disclose a central data store containing shared resource data obtained from the operating system. The Office Action fails to identify a reference numeral in Kanamori corresponding to such a central data store. Applicants respectfully request provision of a reference numeral or other identifier that identifies Kanamori's equivalent of a "central data store" so that applicants may fully respond to this rejection.

Kanamori additionally fails to disclose an update communications server that provides a communications link between a central data server and an operating system resource source.

The Office Action fails to consider the reference in its entirety as applied to claim 33. The Office Action extracts bits and pieces of the Kanamori reference without consideration for the application of the entire reference to the claims. For instance, with respect to claim 33, the Office Action identifies the transferor program as both the "update communications server" and the "client application". It is not feasible for the same component to perform the claimed functions for these elements and indeed the transferor program fails to perform all of the claimed functions.

Accordingly, because Kanamori fails to show each and every feature of claim 33, Kanamori fails to anticipate claim 33. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

With regard to independent claim 38, as explained above, Kanamori fails to show the step of obtaining a single shared copy of resource data for sharing by multiple client applications. Kanamori further fails to disclose processing resource data requests by sharing the single shared copy with multiple client applications making a request for resource data and communicating the processed resource data to the multiple client applications. Furthermore, Kanamori fails to disclose the single shared copy configured to allow sharing of resource data by multiple client applications without creating multiple copies of the shared resource data.

Additionally, with respect to claim 38, the Office Action states on page 3, paragraph 4, that Kanamori discloses "receiving one or more resource data requests from

the applications (request to allocate a global resource of particular type, such as a memory block, that can be accessed by every program..." and cites column 4, lines 20-25 of Kanamori. Applicants note that Column 4, lines 20-25 of Kanamori are directed to what the disclosure of Kanamori cannot accomplish. In a non-global operating system, the operating system cannot respond correctly to a request to allocate a global resource.

Accordingly, because Kanamori fails to show each and every feature of claim 38, Kanamori fails to anticipate claim 38. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1 and therefore are allowable over Kanamori for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Claim 34 depends from claim 33 and claims 39, 41, 43, 44, 51, and 52 depend from claim 38. Accordingly, these dependent claims are allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent base claims 33 and 38. Withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 is respectfully requested.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3, 5, 8, 16, 17, 23-32, 35-37, 40, 42, 45, 53, and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Kanamori in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,754,854 to Matousek. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

All of the aforementioned claims are dependent claims that depend from the independent claims discussed above. Matousek does nothing to obviate the above-noted deficiencies of Kanamori. Even if combined the references fail to disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. While Matousek allows applications to access the operating system, Matousek does not suggest that two or more applications can access a single shared copy of resource data that was obtained from a resource source such as an operating system.

Additionally, no motivation would have existed to modify Kanamori with the disclosure of Matousek. As set forth above, Kanamori is specifically directed to creating multiple copies of data for use by different applications and would have found it unnecessary to allow two or more applications to access a single shared copy in order to avoid duplication of resources.

Accordingly, since the references fail to teach or disclose the invention of claims 3, 5, 8, 16, 17, 23-32, 35-37, 40, 42, 45, 53, and 54, withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-13, 19-22, and 46-50 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as obvious over Kanamori in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,428 to Bril. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Bril fails to obviate the deficiencies of Kanamori as set forth above. All of the dependent claims 9-13, 19-22, and 46-50 define further distinctive features of the invention and are allowable over the art of record for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-13, 19-22, and 46-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

**New Claim 55**


New claim 55 is directed to a method that includes implementing a cross-process server between an operating system and multiple applications originating from a common base program and running as separate processes. The cross-process server obtains system resource data from the operating system. A copy of shared resource data is stored on the cross-process server and is shared with multiple applications. The art of record fails to disclose the aforementioned features. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 55 is allowable over the art of record.

### CONCLUSION

As set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that this application be allowed and passed to issue. Should however any issues remain prior to issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 20, 2004



Kerry H. Owens  
Reg. No. 37,412  
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.,  
Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613  
Phone: (816) 474-6550